Docket No.: 10-005 PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of	:	
	:	
TROAN *et al.*	:	
	:	
Serial No.: 10/699,889	:	Group Art Unit: 2143
	:	
Filed: November 4, 2003	:	Examiner: SIKRI, Anish

For: ARRANGEMENT IN A ROUTER FOR INSERTING ADDRESS PREFIXES BASED ON COMMAND LINE ADDRESS IDENTIFIERS

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Nonfinal Official Action mailed February 26, 2009, Applicant submits the following remarks.

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-21 and 29-35 are pending.

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-18, 21, 29-32, and 35 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0078485 by Narayanan in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0126252 by Abir. This rejection is respectfully traversed, as the rejection fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Each of the independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 29 specify execution of a ***declaration command*** (e.g., 76a of Figure 4A) stored in a ***configuration file*** stored in the router: the declaration command specifies an address prefix identifier and at least one of ***an address prefix value*** associated with the address prefix identifier (see, e.g., entry 76a of Figure 4A, page 6, lines 25-28), or ***a source for the***

address prefix value (e.g., router command 76i of Figure 5B specifies retrieving the address prefix according to DHCP using a client resource 50, see page 8, lines 20-27). The execution of the declaration command causes the storing in the router of an address prefix value into a prescribed storage location that is assigned to the address prefix identifier.

The claims further specify the router executing a second command stored in the configuration file of the router, namely a ***router command*** specifying the address prefix identifier, based on applying the address prefix value ***retrieved from the prescribed storage location*** as an operand in the router command.

The claims further specify that the address prefix identifier is implemented as ***a non-numeric representation*** of an address prefix required as an operand of the router command stored in the configuration file.

Hence, all commands specifying the address prefix identifier can be globally reconfigured and renumbered, merely by changing the prefix value associated with the address prefix identifier, and without any modification to the configuration file or associated executable code (see, e.g., page and page 6, lines 22-24 of the specification).

These and other features are neither disclosed nor suggested in the applied prior art.

Narayanan fails to disclose or suggest the claimed executing a ***declaration command*** stored in a ***configuration file*** stored in the router and that specifies an address prefix identifier and at least an address prefix value or a source for the address prefix value, as claimed, let alone a router command stored in the ***configuration file*** and that specifies the address prefix identifier, as claimed.

To the contrary, Narayanan teaches a router 10 learning a network prefix based on a line card (e.g., 14 of Fig. 1) learning the IP address of a connected host 16: the router processor 12 collects all of the routing information gathered by each line card, and constructs the routing table 12a (see, e.g., para 10, 28, 33).

Hence, Narayanan teaches learning a network prefix based on learned IP source addresses from connected line cards, and neither discloses nor suggests the claimed ***configuration file***, as claimed. As illustrated in Figure 3 of the subject application, the configuration file 52 is distinct from the address routing table 60, hence the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claimed

configuration file cannot be so broad as to encompass the address routing table illustrated in Figure 3.

Moreover, Narayanan fails to disclose or suggest a second ***router command that specifies the address prefix identifier***, as claimed; to the contrary, Narayanan simply teaches learning of IP address prefixes using ingress filtering.

As admitted in the rejection, Narayanan fails to disclose or suggest that the claimed address prefix identifier is a non-numeric representation of an ***address prefix***.

Abir fails to disclose or suggest an address prefix identifier that is a non-numeric representation of an address prefix. To the contrary, Abir simply describes a conventional Domain Name Server (DNS) that provides resolution for users of client computers: the DNS provides a resolution between an Internet domain name (e.g., "www.microsoft.com") and a specific IP address (e.g., "207.46.197.100") (see, e.g., para. 5). Moreover, Abir teaches that a "domain name" is an alphanumeric representation of an Internet site having a host computer system.

Hence, Abir teaches resolution between a host computer domain name and an IP address, as opposed to the claimed non-numeric representation of an ***address prefix*** that is an ***operand*** in at least one ***stored router command in the configuration file***. The rejection fails to provide any rational basis to conclude that one skilled in the art would interpret from Abir that the disclosed DNS resolution between a domain name and an IP address could be considered a teaching of the claimed non-numeric representation of an ***address prefix*** that is an operand in a ***router command***, as claimed.

In fact, Abir teaches away from the claimed non-numeric representation ***in the router*** because DNS resolution is used to provide a client computer operated by a user with the IP address of a host computer system for an Internet site (see, e.g., para. 5-7).

For these and other reasons, the §103 rejection of the independent claims should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is believed this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any

missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), to Deposit Account No. 50-1130, under Order No. 10-005, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leon R. Turkevich #34035/

Leon R. Turkevich
Registration No. 34,035

Customer No. 23164
(202) 261-1059
Date: May 26, 2009